



# JUDICIAL BRANCH COVID-19 TASK FORCE MEETING

June 4, 2020

Task Force Co Chair, the Honorable Jay Corpening, convened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. by WebEx.

## **Reminder of Open Meeting and Roll Call:**

Judge Corpening stated that the meeting is subject to North Carolina's open meetings laws and that a livestream had been made available to the public and members of the media. North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts (NCAOC) Research and Planning Associate Emily Mehta took roll call. The following Task Force members were present via WebEx:

- The Honorable F. Donald Bridges, Co-Chair, District 27B Senior Resident Superior Court Judge.
- The Honorable Jay Corpening, Co-Chair, District 5 Chief District Court Judge.
- The Honorable Wayland Sermons, District 2 Senior Resident Superior Court Judge.
- The Honorable Teresa Vincent, District 18 Chief District Court Judge.
- The Honorable Billy West, District 14 District Attorney.
- The Honorable Robert Evans, District 8 District Attorney.
- The Honorable Marsha Johnson, Harnett County Clerk of Superior Court.
- The Honorable Elisa Chinn-Gary, Mecklenburg County Clerk of Superior Court.
- Kinsley Craig, District 27B Trial Court Coordinator.
- Kellie Myers, District 10 Trial Court Administrator.
- The Honorable Jason Cheek, Davidson County Magistrate.
- The Honorable Jennifer Harjo, New Hanover County Public Defender.
- John McCabe, Attorney and Appointee of the North Carolina Advocates for Justice (NCAJ).
- Wade Harrison, Attorney and Appointee of the North Carolina Bar Association (NCBA).
- Patrick Weede, Attorney and Appointee of the NCBA.
- JD Keister, Attorney and Appointee of the North Carolina Association of Defense Attorneys (NCADA) was not present for roll call but joined the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

Anna Stearns, Chief of Staff and General Counsel to Chief Justice Beasley, was present via WebEx, as was the Honorable Chuck Henry, District 4 Senior Resident Superior Court Judge. A number of additional people joined the WebEx as representatives of NCAOC, the Office of Indigent Defense Services (IDS), and the School of Government (SOG) in their capacity as advisers and staff to the Task Force, as did Richmond County Sheriff James Clemmons.

## **Approval of May 28, 2020 Task Force Meeting Minutes:**

Attorney Harrison moved to approve the minutes of the May 28, 2020 meeting, and Attorney Weede seconded the motion. All Task Force members approved the meeting minutes by a roll call vote.





### **Finalize Immediate Recommendations:**

Judge Corpening said the Task Force is moving toward finalizing all of its immediate recommendations for its first report to the Chief Justice, and he thanked all of the working groups for crafting recommendations that will be helpful to everyone in the field.

### **Best Safety Practices Working Group:**

Trial Court Administrator Myers said she has not received any suggestions or feedback regarding the Best Safety Practices Working Group's draft recommendations that were presented at the last meeting. She added that the working group has not met since the last Task Force meeting because she was focused on the courthouse damage that occurred over the weekend and the expansion of court proceedings that began on June 2. Trial Court Administrator Myers said she and Chief of Staff Stearns have interns from the North Carolina Department of Health and Human Services and UNC School of Law starting the following week, and they will be working on drafting best safety practices for jury trials that will be presented to the working group and then to the full Task Force.

### **Technology and Innovations Working Group:**

Judge Henry said the Technology and Innovations Working Group finalized their intermediate recommendations that morning, adding that the group has developed some draft jury trial suggestions that they plan to include in their long-term recommendations. Judge Henry said he hopes to have the long-term recommendations to the Task Force by the end of the next week.

### **Virus Fatigue Working Group:**

SOG Professor Jim Drennan said the Virus Fatigue Working Group has created three different products to send to the field as soon as possible:

1. A "Caring for You" video intended to build awareness about the stress that everyone is under and to convey the message that we are all in this together;
2. A "Caring for You" document that details the signs of stress and some strategies for dealing with them, as well as some more intensive resources for people who need extra help, plus a one-page companion version that could be taped to a desk or posted on a bulletin board; and
3. A colorful "Help Now!" poster from the National Trauma Institute that contains suggestions for what people can do in the moment when they are feeling stressed. He suggested that those posters could be posted on breakroom bulletin boards in courthouses.

Professor Drennan said the documents are close to being ready for distribution, and he thanked NCAOC Court Management Specialist Lori Cole and NCAOC's Communications Division for their excellent work shepherding those documents into a visually appealing format. Professor Drennan said the draft video is ready, although it is not yet final and there are a few more court representatives to add to it. The Task Force members viewed the draft video via WebEx.

Judge Corpening thanked Professor Drennan and the working group for creating the video. Professor Drennan said the working group will now coordinate with NCAOC's Communications Division to





determine the best way to distribute these resources, and he invited anyone with suggestions to share them with him or NCAOC Deputy Director of Court Programs, Danielle Carman. He noted that some of the information in the “Caring for You” documents is internal to court system employees, but most of the information is relevant to everyone. The current plan is to distribute the materials to court system personnel and then to think about potential wider circulation. Professor Drennan said the working group would continue to meet to discuss other possible initiatives that would be helpful to the field.

#### Resumption of Jury Trials:

Judge Bridges said he hopes all Task Force members received an email from him the day before about the Technology and Innovations Working Group’s new recommendations regarding the resumption of jury trials. Judge Bridges said the Task Force had a very close vote during the prior week’s meeting about its jury trial recommendations, and he has significant reservations about making a date recommendation when the Task Force is so far away from speaking with one voice or even a substantially united voice. He said he was struck by the number of well-founded and justifiable concerns that were expressed, and the full Task Force needs to consider and discuss those concerns further.

Judge Bridges said the Task Force’s goal is to submit its first interim report to the Chief Justice by June 15. He said that is not a hard deadline, but the Task Force does have a hard deadline of June 30 to submit its recommendations with respect to jury trials. Judge Bridges asked whether it is realistic to think the Task Force will be able to include jury trial recommendations in its first report or whether it would make more sense to include those recommendations in a second report to be submitted by June 30.

Trial Court Administrator Myers said it would not be realistic for the Best Safety Practices Working Group to have a quality product with developed safety recommendations for jury trials in time to include in the first interim report. She said the working group focused first on what the courts can do now safely, with the view that the next phase of expansion would involve the safe resumption of jury trials. She said the Chief Justice’s order gives the Task Force until June 30 to submit jury trial recommendations, and she believes the Task Force should use that additional time to continue to refine its recommendations.

Judge Bridges said one of the principles that is implicit in the current draft plan for resuming trials is that any trials will be conducted in compliance with all best safety practices that come from the Task Force through the Best Safety Practices Working Group. He said that working group has already provided recommendations for best safety practices for in-person court proceedings, and he asked if the group plans to submit additional recommendations for jury trials. Trial Court Administrator Myers said yes, adding that she expects the working group to have those recommendations in time for inclusion in a June 30 report.

Judge Sermons agreed that the Task Force needs more time to refine its jury trial recommendations. District Attorney West said his only concern about waiting for the June 30 report is that the district attorneys have suggested a start date of August 3 and a delay in that recommendation could put the





Chief Justice and local judicial officials in a tough position. Otherwise, District Attorney West said he agrees with being prudent and he understands that the Task Force is only talking about a delay of 15 days.

Judge Bridges directed the Task Force members to the Technology and Innovations Working Group's intermediate recommendations, which contained a section on the resumption of jury trials. Judge Henry said Attorney Harrison raised concerns about the resumption of jury trials with that working group, and they developed some suggestions as a result of their discussion of those concerns. He said the working group is not attempting to put itself in an adversarial position with the work other groups have done on this topic, but he is concerned about North Carolina's statistics on COVID-19 cases and deaths.

Judge Henry referred to the recommendations that the Best Safety Practices Working Group presented at the May 28, 2020 Task Force meeting. He noted that those recommendations state that public health officials are not aware of specific guidance for courthouses, that the recommended six-foot separation for social distancing is for casual interactions of less than 10 minutes, and that one hour is considered to be a prolonged period of time. He said his question for public health officials is what the risks are for people who are required to be in a room for six hours a day, five days a week for a multi-week trial.

Judge Henry said he personally believes that it will be possible to resume jury trials the week of August 3, but everyone needs to start with shorter trials. He added that, assuming all social distancing requirements are in place, along with masks and proper hygiene, the Task Force needs public health guidance on the risks that local judicial officials can convey to jury panels. He said the Task Force does not know the risks associated with lengthy exposure over a period of weeks if someone is an asymptomatic spreader, and that makes it difficult to make a decision about a specific date. Judge Henry said he concurs with most of the district attorneys' recommendations, but the court system cannot guarantee safety and can only express the steps it has taken to reduce risk. He said he understands that local judicial officials need a date to plan for, but the Task Force needs more information from public health officials before it can ask citizens to serve as jurors in lengthy trials. He added that the Technology and Innovations Working Group's suggestion for the resumption of lengthy criminal jury trials is late November 2020.

Attorney Harrison said he thinks it is incumbent on the Task Force to provide as much guidance and information to the Chief Justice as possible. He said the Task Force has intentionally diverse representation, and he was concerned about the vote at the last meeting primarily because he thought there was an articulation of various points of view without any cohesive underlying structure. Attorney Harrison said the Technology and Innovations Working Group's proposal is essentially a three-legged stool. The first and most important leg is science and public health. Attorney Harrison said courthouses are places to which people come without having a choice, and the court system has a duty to make them as safe as possible. The second leg is the idea of giving authority to the people who are responsible for making the courthouses safe, which is why the proposal requires the senior resident superior court judge and the elected clerk of superior court to agree that appropriate conditions and procedures are in place to allow for the safe resumption of jury trials. Attorney Harrison said the last leg is fundamental





fairness, noting that serious felony trials and long civil trials inherently put people at more risk. Attorney Harrison said we still do not know enough about the way this virus spreads or the extent to which people spending long amounts of time together is a problem, even with everyone wearing masks. As a result, he said people facing serious felonies and lengthy trials should not be the guinea pigs for a new approach to jury trials. Attorney Harrison said that is why the working group is recommending that Class A, B1, and B2 jury trials be deferred until six months after the end of the stay-at-home order, or November 30. Attorney Harrison said the working group's recommended approach would allow some trials to go forward starting August 3, as long as all three legs are under the stool locally. Attorney Harrison said this is similar in many ways to what the district attorneys have recommended, although it includes consultation with the clerk of superior court and, for criminal trials, with the district attorney and a representative of the defense bar. He said he believes that proposal provides sufficient checks and balances and allows for the involvement of all local officials who have responsibility for ensuring that trials are conducted safely.

District Attorney Evans said, to the extent the Task Force determines we have not yet reached an appropriate level of safety from a science and health standpoint, he is not opposed to the recommendations. He said, ultimately, no trials are going to take place until local officials have determined they can be held safely. District Attorney Evans said the ultimate arbiter of whether a specific case is ripe for trial is the presiding judge, and the Task Force needs to be careful about creating artificial barriers that prevent that process from taking place. He said all districts now have COVID-19 facility coordinators and many have created local COVID-19 teams, which he assumes will include representatives of all of the local stakeholders as they decide whether to go forward with jury trials. District Attorney Evans said he does not want the Task Force to impose a "one size fits all" solution, and some of the working group's proposal is closer to that than he is comfortable with. District Attorney Evans noted that his office covers three counties, and he does not think all three will resume jury trials at the same time. He said he is comfortable with the Task Force gathering and providing as much safety information as possible, but not with putting barriers in front of the people we have always entrusted with decisions about whether and what type of trials can go forward.

Judge Vincent noted that jury trials are held in district court as well, and the chief district court judges should be part of that decision-making process. She stressed that the senior resident superior court judges and clerks of superior court should not make decisions about district court jury trials.

Clerk Johnson said, at a procedural level, a lot happens before a case goes to trial and there are some logistics that would have to be addressed now to be ready for a jury trial by August 3. She said the clerks would have to send out summons during the week of June 29 and, before they could do that, they would have to know logistics like where potential jurors should report and whether jury orientation would be done in one group or in staggered groups. Clerk Johnson said those are logistical decisions that will need to be made by judicial leaders in each county, and she does not think that can happen by August 3. Clerk Johnson said there are not many courthouses in North Carolina that can accommodate 75 to 100 people who are socially distanced. She said the state is still in the "emergency curtailment limited operations" phase described in the Task Force's draft report, and she does not think jury trials





should resume until the courts have reached the “relaxed social distancing” phase. Clerk Johnson said there is a very high level of transmission in North Carolina right now, and that is reflected in reduced staffing in many clerks’ offices. She stressed that jury trials require more personnel and that she is not comfortable with an August 3 start date.

Judge Bridges said the current draft of the Task Force’s report contains an extensive discussion of the importance of consultation between the senior resident superior court judge and clerk of superior court, because of the need to coordinate logistics such as the lead time required for summons and staggered orientations. Judge Bridges said the draft report also stresses the need for local officials to conduct “walk throughs” that allow them to physically observe the spaces that jurors will occupy. He said it will be an important part of preparing for officials to physically observe those spaces, take measurements, and visualize the accommodations that will need to be made to conduct trials safely. Judge Bridges stressed that judges should walk the path that jurors will walk from the minute they enter the courthouse until the end of their service, and that judges must be mindful of the safety of every other trial participant as well.

Judge Bridges noted that the clerks have raised serious concerns about August 3 as a starting date for the resumption of jury trials, and he asked if they have a suggested date. Clerk Johnson said the clerks have not discussed a specific date, but trials are going to be challenging as long as there are social distancing requirements. Clerk Johnson said she believes the phase is a more appropriate marker than a specific date for when trials should resume, and she suggested that it should be later in the fall after the courts have moved into the “relaxed social distancing” phase.

Clerk Chinn-Gary said she appreciated Attorney Harrison’s description of the working groups’ three-legged approach, noting that all three legs are important considerations. Clerk Chinn-Gary said she has done a walk through, and the juror deliberation rooms in her courthouse will not accommodate social distancing. She said they have received information from local health officials about cross seating and the dangers of using it in this phase of transmission. She said it is unclear where they can put large groups of potential jurors, noting that the structural issues are real and complex. Clerk Chinn-Gary said she has talked to her local public health officials about lengthy exposure to other people during in-person hearings, and their recommendation was to encourage the court to take breaks during sessions and, if that is not feasible, to rotate her staff so that no one is sitting for long periods of time in an intact area. Clerk Chinn-Gary stressed that those were the recommendations even with social distancing, so the clerks are adamant in their view that August 3 would be premature, particularly in light of the state’s rising case numbers.

District Attorney West said he is concerned about the arbitrary classification of offenses in the Technology and Innovations Working Group’s recommendations, and said he prefers a more localized approach. District Attorney West said he is not aware of another state where the Chief Justice has determined when trials can resume based on the class of offense, and he thinks there might be some constitutional problems with that approach. He said he understands the health concerns, but many states have either begun or are about to begin jury trials, and August 3 is on the later end of what other





states are doing. District Attorney West said the COVID-19 coordinators and local teams are in place and should be given discretion to determine when jury trials are safe in specific jurisdictions. He said he doubts there are many counties that are looking to resume capital murder trials on August 3, but the local teams are the best place for those decisions to be made. District Attorney West said the district attorneys have statutory responsibility for calendaring criminal cases, and trial judges can continue any specific trials if they deem that to be appropriate. He said this is ultimately a decision for the Chief Justice and local judicial officials, and he does not think the Task Force should micromanage this issue.

District Attorney Evans said if jury trials are not allowed to resume until the fall, that would put us dangerously close to the end of the calendar year. He said everyone needs to be mindful of the fact that there are very few serious trials scheduled after the first week of November, so that would leave a very short window for the speedy administration of justice. District Attorney Evans added that he thinks it is important to recommend a specific date to the Chief Justice and he does not think it should be too far into the fall.

Judge Bridges said the criminal defense bar expressed significant opposition to the jury trial motion at the last meeting, and asked Attorney Weede and Public Defender Harjo if they had additional comments. Attorney Weede said he is a member of the Technology and Innovations Working Group, and he supports that group's proposal. He said the district attorneys' concerns about waiting until November for serious felony trials might be addressed by clarifying that they can be held before that date if both the state and the defendant consent, adding that might also address some of the speedy trial concerns. Attorney Weede said it might make sense to wait for the additional jury trial recommendations from the Best Safety Practices Working Group before making a final decision with respect to a start date. He said the mechanism by which each county determines when they are ready to proceed with trials is a separate issue, noting that there are a lot of concerns about jurors and court personnel sitting through lengthy trials.

Public Defender Harjo said North Carolina just reported the highest number of new cases in one day, so she is concerned that the virus is still on the upswing. She said she agrees with the clerks that August 3 is not a viable start date, and she appreciates and agrees with the thoughtful recommendations from the Technology and Innovations Working Group. Public Defender Harjo said she does not agree that those recommendations arbitrarily infringe on judges' discretion. She said we are in the middle of a worldwide pandemic and we need to start out slowly with resuming jury trials so that we can provide as many safety assurances as possible for everyone. Public Defender Harjo said she is concerned about jurors, but she is also concerned about the defense attorneys who have to interact closely with their clients. She said incarcerated people are at a very high risk of exposure, noting that she had video contact with three in-custody clients the night before and watched them each get on the phone one after the other with no cleaning of the phone or room in between. She said contact with incarcerated clients puts the defense attorneys at high risk of exposure as well.

Public Defender Harjo said the clients have constitutional rights they can waive, and if a defendant wants to waive the right to observe a witness' face during testimony, he or she can do so. However, other





defendants may not want to waive those rights, which is why she previously suggested allowing trials to resume on August 3 if the defendant consents. Public Defender Harjo said she also wants to see the Best Safety Practices Working Group's jury trial recommendations and model safety plan. She said, assuming the local COVID-19 coordinator has developed a safety plan that has been approved by the senior resident superior court judge and clerk of superior court, local officials can then start to look at what trials can take place. Public Defender Harjo said she agrees with the suggestion of starting with short trials and then gradually moving to more lengthy trials. She added that she does not believe the district attorneys have calendaring authority in other states, so what other states are doing might not be a good benchmark for what is best in North Carolina.

Attorney McCabe said he has been operating under the assumption that this group would not recommend a resumption of jury trials unless it could be done safely. He said the civil bar is ready to resume jury trials on August 3, but not at the risk of jeopardizing people's safety. Attorney McCabe added that the clerks' concerns carry a lot of weight with him, and said he is not advocating to resume trials if the courthouses are not ready to do them safely. Judge Bridges said he agrees that trials should only resume if they are in compliance with the Best Safety Practices Working Group's recommendations that have not yet been fully developed. He added that he wants the Task Force's report to emphasize to the Chief Justice that trials should not resume until they can be held safely. Attorney Keister said he agrees with Attorney McCabe about the position of the civil bar, adding that he is particularly swayed by the concerns expressed by the clerks. He said the Technology and Innovations Working Group proposal was developed to get more buy-in from the clerks and court managers.

Judge Bridges said when the Task Force took its initial vote the prior week, he did not fully understand the nature and extent of the concerns that were expressed during the discussion on that motion. He said he is hearing two significant points in today's discussion: 1) August 3 may be too soon to resume trials safely; and 2) the proposal from the Technology and Innovations Working Group seems like an appropriate framework that might be used in crafting a recommendation for the Chief Justice. Judge Bridges stated that the Chief Justice has not specifically requested that the Task Force recommend a date certain for the resumption of trials and that the Task Force will have carried out its mission if it crafts a plan for the resumption of trials that leaves the earliest possible date to the Chief Justice. He said one possibility is to craft a plan that stresses the importance of waiting until trials can be conducted safely and that addresses all of the prerequisites and safeguards that the Task Force members deem appropriate for local officials to consider when crafting their own plans. Judge Bridges reiterated that the Chief Justice has asked for those recommendations by June 30.

Judge Bridges asked how the Task Force members felt about developing a recommended plan for the Chief Justice and leaving the earliest date to her determination with appropriate time for the clerks to issue summons. District Attorney West said if the Task Force's approach is to provide safety recommendations for what local officials need to do before trials can resume, he believes the differentiation between specific dates for different types of cases in the Technology and Innovations Working Group recommendation should be omitted. District Attorney Evans agreed, adding that he does





not believe it is tenable to get that far into the weeds and he does not understand how the Best Safety Practices Working Group recommendations would relate to the type of case being tried.

Attorney Weede said, even if the Task Force adopts the Technology and Innovations Working Group's proposal without reference to specific dates, the Task Force's report needs to address the concerns that have been raised about August 3 being too soon for lengthy and complex trials and to stress the suggestion of starting with short civil and criminal trials. Judge Sermons reiterated that "one size does not fit all" and said no one in the state will be able to try a case without having consulted with every local stakeholder. He said he is moving forward with a potential trial on August 10 in one of his counties. He added that might not work out but there needs to be flexibility and cooperation at a local level.

Trial Court Administrator Myers returned to Judge Bridges' earlier question about whether the Task Force wants to include jury trial recommendations in its first report or in a second report to be submitted by June 30. Judge Bridges said he believes the group reached consensus to proceed with the submission of this first report without including jury trial recommendations. Trial Court Administrator Myers so moved, and Judge Vincent seconded the motion. All Task Force members approved the motion by a roll call vote.

Judge Bridges asked whether the Task Force should omit a recommended date for the resumption of jury trials from its second report and leave the date determination to the Chief Justice based on her assessment of when it would be safe to do so. Judge Sermons asked how that would impact local officials like him who are working toward a jury trial on August 10 if she determines it should be a later date. He said the Chief Justice provided a date in her May 21 order and many officials have relied on that. Deputy Director Carman said she is not sure the Chief Justice has ordered a specific date, noting that her May 21 order said she intends to extend the prohibition on jury trials though "at least" the end of July.

Trial Court Administrator Myers said she agrees that the Task Force should focus on the substance of how to safely resume jury trials and then revisit possibly including a date if that can be done by June 30. Judge Vincent agreed. Judge Bridges said the superior court judges' work group has done a lot of work on the current draft plan, and he suggested reconvening that group the following week to further refine it. Judge Bridges said that group will seek to incorporate the Best Safety Practices Working Group's recommendations on in-person proceedings and jury trials, as well as the Technology and Innovations Working Group's recommendations. In the meantime, he asked the conference of chief district court judges to review the draft and provide feedback, including Judge Vincent's suggestion that the chief district court judges be part of local groups making jury trial plans. Judge Bridges said the refined plan would be brought back to the Task Force at its next meeting.

Judge Bridges referred to Public Defender Harjo's comments about allowing earlier criminal trials to proceed with the consent of the defendant, and he asked if her concerns would be met by the addition of a specific provision directing the presiding judges who are the ultimate decision makers to consider the defendant's consent or lack thereof. Public Defender Harjo said it would be helpful and comforting





to the clients and the attorneys to know that whatever protections are in place to accommodate a jury trial are being made with the consent of the defendant.

Judge Corpening said the Task Force appears to have reached some consensus about obtaining additional information from the superior court judges and the chief district court judges, and then incorporating the forthcoming Best Safety Practices Working Group recommendations about trials. He said the jury trial section will be removed from the draft of the first interim report to the Chief Justice, and the Task Force will receive additional information about jury trials at its next meeting. Judge Corpening asked Trial Court Administrator Myers if the Best Safety Practices Working Group is in a position to have recommendations for the Task Force's review late the following week. Trial Court Administrator Myers said the recommendations may not be polished by then, but the working group would have something for the full Task Force to review.

#### Suggested Statutory or Rule Changes and Additional Funding Concerns:

Judge Bridges said any recommended statutory or rule changes, as well as funding concerns, can be addressed in the second report that is to be submitted by June 30. Now that the working groups have completed their initial work, Judge Bridges asked them to think about whether anything they have already recommended or are considering recommending may require statutory revisions or rule changes from the Supreme Court. If so, he asked the working groups to provide a list of the proposed changes to be included in a separate section of the second report.

In addition, Judge Bridges asked each working group to thinking about what, if any, additional funding would be needed to implement their recommendations. Judge Corpening said, even if it is not possible to identify an exact amount of funding that would be needed, it would be helpful for the report to address the funding needs associated with all of the recommendations.

#### Approval of Draft Report to Chief Justice

Judge Corpening thanked Deputy Director Carman for her drafting efforts, and he said she would remove anything related to jury trials from the first interim report. Carman added that she would also remove the section on suggested statutory and rule changes. She asked whether the Task Force wants the Technology and Innovations Working Group's other intermediate recommendations to be included in this first report or held for the second report. Judge Corpening suggested including only the immediate recommendations in this first report and leaving the intermediate and long-term recommendations for the second report to be addressed along with the jury trial recommendations. Judge Bridges agreed.

With the removal of the sections on jury trials and statutory or rule changes, as well as Appendix E, Judge Corpening asked if there was a motion to approve the draft report for submission to the Chief Justice. Judge Vincent so moved, and Attorney McCabe seconded the motion. All Task Force members approved the motion by a roll call vote.





**Goals for Next Meeting and Date:**

Judge Corpening said the chief district court judges are meeting on June 11 at 1:00, so he suggested holding the next Task Force meeting on June 11 at 2:30 p.m. He said the primary goal for that meeting would be to receive further input from various stakeholder groups on the resumption of jury trials. Judge Bridges added that it would be helpful to begin the discussion of recommended statutory or rule changes and funding requests.

The meeting adjourned at 4:08 p.m.

